



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Brachos Daf Tes Vuv

#### MISHNA

- Someone who says shema and does not hear what he is saying, is yotzeh. **R' Yose** says he is not yotzeh.
- Someone who says shema, but does not clearly enunciate the letters: **R' Yose** says he is yotzeh and **R' Yehudah** says he is not yotzeh.
- One who reads shema backwards is not yotzeh. If someone said shema and made a mistake, he must return to the place of the mistake (and read from there).

#### GEMARA

- **R' Yose** says that the word "shema" teaches that one must hear what he is saying. The **T"K** says that "shema" teaches that it may be said in any language. **R' Yose** says both things can be learned from "shema".
- A Mishna says, a deaf person, who can speak but can't hear, should not separate terumah (because he can't hear his bracha), but if he did, the separation is effective.
  - **Q:** Whose view is it that l'chatchila he should not separate terumah, but b'dieved it is valid? **A: R' Chisda** said, the Mishnah must follow **R' Yose**, because according to **R' Yehudah**, even by shema – a D'Oraisa – one need not hear what he is saying l'chatchila, so by terumah, whose bracha is only D'Rabanan, certainly one need not hear it. **R' Yose** says that shema, which is a D'Oraisa, one must hear it, by the bracha for terumah, which is only D'Rabanan, if he did not hear it, it will be valid b'dieved.
    - **Q:** Maybe the Mishnah follows **R' Yehudah** and our Mishna of shema is discussing a case of b'dieved ("hakorei" – b'dieved), and only then does **R' Yehudah** permit not hearing the shema!? **A: R' Yehuda** really holds that even l'chatchila one need not hear shema. The reason the Mishna says "hakorei" – which suggests b'dieved – is to teach that **R' Yose** says he is not yotzeh even b'dieved.
      - **Q:** A Braisa says, one may not say birchas hamazon without hearing what he is saying, and if he does so he is yotzeh b'dieved. Now, according to **R' Chisda** who does this Braisa follow? It can't be **R' Yose**, because he says that even b'dieved he is not yotzeh, and it can't be **R' Yehuda**, because he says that he is yotzeh even l'chatchila!? **A:** Rather, it must be that **R' Yehuda** says he is only yotzeh b'dieved, and the Braisa follows **R' Yehuda**.
      - **R' Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon ben Pazi** taught in a Braisa that a deaf person who can speak but can't hear may separate terumah even l'chatchila. According to this last answer who would this Braisa follow!? **A1: R' Yehuda** himself says that even l'chatchila one need not hear what he is saying (and he is therefore the Tanna of the Braisa regarding terumah), but in the name of his rebbi **R' Elazar ben Azarya**, he says that he is only yotzeh b'dieved (and he is the Tanna of the Braisa regarding birchas hamazon). We find this view of **R' Elazar ben Azarya** in a Mishna, where he is argued on by **R' Meir** (who says that even l'chatchila one need not hear when he says shema). **A2:** We can say that **R' Yehuda** agrees with his rebbi. The Braisa of **R' Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon ben Pazi** will follow the view of **R' Meir**, and the other Braisos (that say it is only valid b'dieved) will follow the view of **R' Yehuda and R' Elazar ben Azarya**.

- A Mishna says, all are valid to read the Megilla except for a deaf person, a “shoteh” (deranged person) and a minor (i.e. a deaf person cannot read it because he does not hear what he says). **R’ Yehuda** says that a minor is valid.
  - **Q:** Who is the **T”K** who holds that a deaf person is not valid even b’dieved? **A:** **R’ Masna** said, it is **R’ Yose**, who requires hearing what one is saying by shema even b’dieved.
    - **Q:** Maybe the **T”K** disallows a deaf person only l’chatchilla, and therefore follows **R’ Yehuda** of our Mishan who says that by shema l’chatchila one does need to hear what he is saying!? **A:** The **T”K** compares a deaf person to a shoteh and a minor, who are pasul even b’dieved, so the **T”K** must mean that a deaf person is also passul b’dieved. **A2:** The **T”K** can’t be **R’ Yehuda**, because **R’ Yehudah** himself argues on the **T”K** in that Mishnah.
      - **Q:** This second answer is not valid. It may be that the entire Mishna is the view of **R’ Yehuda**. In the beginning he is referring to a minor who has not yet reached the age of “chinuch” (and that is when he is passul even b’dieved), and at the end he is referring to a minor who has reached the age of chinuch (and that is why it is valid even l’chatchila)!
        - **Q:** Based on this the Mishna regarding megilla is the view of **R’ Yehuda**, which means that regarding shema he holds that l’chatchila one must hear what he says, but b’dieved he is yotzeh even if he does not. According to this, who does the Braisa of **R’ Yehuda in the name of R’ Shimon ben Pazi** follow when it says that a deaf person can separate terumah even l’chatchila!? It can’t follow **R’ Yehuda** or **R’ Yose**!? You can’t say that it must be that **R’ Yehuda** holds that one is yotzeh shema l’chatchila even if he doesn’t hear what he is saying, because then who does the Braisa regarding birchas hamazon follow when it says that l’chatchila one must hear what he is saying!? **A1:** **R’ Yehuda** himself says that even l’chatchila one need not hear what he is saying (and he is therefore the Tanna of the Braisa regarding terumah), but in the name of his rebbi **R’ Elazar ben Azarya**, he says that he is only yotzeh b’dieved (and he is the Tanna of the Braisa regarding birchas hamazon). We find this view of **R’ Elazar ben Azarya** in a Mishna, where he is argued on by **R’ Meir** (who says that even l’chatchila one need not hear when he says shema). **A2:** We can say that **R’ Yehuda** agrees with his rebbi. The Braisa of **R’ Yehuda in the name of R’ Shimon ben Pazi** will follow the view of **R’ Meir**, and the other Braisa (regarding birchas hamazon and the Mishna regarding megilla, that say it is only valid b’dieved) will follow the view of **R’ Yehuda and R’ Elazar ben Azarya**.
          - **R’ Chisda in the name of R’ Shila** says that we pasken like **R’ Yehuda in the name of R’ Elazar ben Azarya** and we pasken like **R’ Yehuda**.
            - Both rulings are needed. If we would only say the second ruling we would think that even l’chatchila one need not hear the shema as he says it, and if we only had the first ruling we would say that even b’dieved he is not yotzeh.
  - **R’ Yosef** says, the machlokes is only regarding shema, because the pasuk says “Shema Yisrael”, but regarding all other mitzvos all agree that one need not hear what one is saying.

## KARAH V'LO DIKDEIK B'OSIYOSEHA

- **R' Tavi in the name of R' Yoshiya** paskens like **R' Yehuda** that one need not hear the words of shema, and like **R' Yose** that clear enunciation of shema is not needed to be yotzeh.
- **R' Tavi in the name of R' Yoshiya** says, the pasuk in Mishlei mentions the “grave” right before mentioning the “womb”. This teaches that just as a womb takes in and give out (birth), so too graves take in and will IY”H give out (from here we see t’chiyas hameysim from the Torah). We can also darshen a kal v’chomer – if the womb, which takes in quietly, gives out with such screaming and commotion (at birth), the grave, which takes in with crying and commotion (of the mourners), will surely give out with much noise and commotion (a shofar’s blow and the happiness of that time).
- **R' Oshaya** said in front of **Rava** that the pasuk of “U’chsavtam” (“a full writing”) teaches that even the psukim which command us to write mezuzos and tefillin are written into the mezuzos and tefillin. **Rava** asked, presumably you say this according to the view of **R' Yehuda** who says that the psukim that command us to write the curses for the sotah are not written – only the actual curses are written. Now, he learns that from an exclusionary term of “alos ha’eileh” regarding sotah. In shema there is no such exclusionary term, so even without the pasuk of “U’chsavtam” these psukim should be written! He answered, we would have thought to learn a gezeira shava from sotah on the word “ksiva” to teach that these additional psukim should not be written. That is why the pasuk of “U’chsavtam” is needed to teach that they are written.
- **R' Ovadia** taught a Braisa in front of **Rava** that said, the pasuk of “V’limadtem” (“a complete learning”), teaches that one should pause before a word that begins with the same sound as the previous word ended with. **Rava** then gave examples of such words in kriyas shema.
  - **R' Chama B'Rebbi Chanina** darshened a pasuk to teach that one who is careful with his enunciation of kriyas shema has Gehinnom cooled down for him.

**R' Chama B'Rebbi Chanina** said, the pasuk mentions “tents” next to “streams” to teach that just as a stream is me’taher a person, so too “tents” (i.e. a Beis Medrash) of Torah can exonerate a person (and purify him from his sins).